LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

RECEIVED

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

OCT 19 2000

GENERAL COUNSEL OF COPYRIGHT

COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

In the Matter of:
Distribution of 1993, 1994,
1995, 1996 and 1997 Cable
Royalty Funds

| Docket No. 2000-2 | CARP CD 93-97

Tuesday, October 17, 2000

The conference took place at 2:00 p.m., in Room 414 of the Library of Congress' Madison Building, 101 Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20559.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE DOROTHY K. CAMPBELL, Chairperson
THE HONORABLE JOHN W. COOLEY
THE HONORABLE MARK J. DAVIS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Appearances:

On Behalf of Independent Producers Group:

ARNOLD P. LUTZKER, ESQ.
Lutzker & Lutzker, LLP
1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 450
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/408-7603
202/408-7677 fax

On Behalf of Program Suppliers:

MICHAEL E. TUCCI, ESQ.
GREGORY O. OLANIRAN, ESQ.
Morrison & Hecker, LLP
1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-3816
202/785-9100
202/785-9163

JAMES J. POPHAM, ESQ.
Motion Picture Association of America
1600 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/293-1966

Also Present:

GINA GIUFFREDA, Copyright Office BILL ROBERTS, Copyright Office

INDEX

OPENING REMARKS, BILL ROBERTS, COPYRIGHT OFFICE	4
REMARKS, CHAIRPERSON DOROTHY K. CAMPBELL	8
REMARKS, MICHAEL E. TUCCI, PROGRAM SUPPLIERS 1	L1
PROPOSED SCHEDULE DISCUSSION	30
PROPOSED REVISED SCHEDULE DISCUSSION 2	25
DATLY GOVERNMENT DISCUSSION 3	2

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

2:05 P.M.

21

22

MR. ROBERTS: In an other time-honored tradition, since the Copyright Royalty Tribunal was eliminated and we started the CARP process here at the Copyright Office, I have had the honor of throwing out the first pitch. Actually, in some times past I actually did have a baseball to get everybody's signature on, but there was no money in the budget for this time to pay for a baseball to throw out. But I welcome everyone here today to start this proceeding for the 1997 Cable Royalties, a Phase II distribution proceeding and I'm pleased to present to you today our Arbitrators and I will start with our Chairperson, Dorothy Campbell from Nashville, Tennessee. immediate left is Mark Davis from New Louisiana and over here is Jack Cooley from Chicago, Illinois. And rather than me do the introductions of the people, Arnie, I will start with you and you can just inform the Arbitrators who you are and who you represent.

MR. LUTZKER: Okay, I'm Arnie Lutzker. My

law firm is Lutzker and Lutzker. People always ask 1 who the other Lutzker is, my wife. And I represent 2 3 the Independent Producers Group. MR. TUCCI: My name is Michael Tucci with 4 5 the law firm of Morrison & Hecker and I represent the 6 Program Suppliers. 7 MR. OLANIRAN: I'm Greg Olaniran. I'm with Morrison & Hecker also. 8 I represent Program 9 Suppliers. I'm Jim Popham. 10 MR. POPHAM: I'm Vice 11 President and Statutory License Counsel for the Motion 12 Picture Association, also on behalf of the Program 13 Suppliers. And with me just since the room is so small is my Legal Assistant Jo Popham, and yes, 14 15 there's a connection. 16 (Laughter.) 17 MR. ROBERTS: As I think all of you are 18 familiar the way the CARP process works is we at the 19 Copyright Office and the Library up to this point in 20 time have been the authority and in charge of marshalling this proceeding to this point and then we 21 22 now turn it over officially to the Arbitrators.

Today, marks Day 1 of the 180-day time period. decision is due on or before the 16th of April of next year, the day after Tax Day which I guess since Tax Day falls on Sunday, it will be Tax Day on which this decision is due. Of course, all of you are familiar with rulings that we have issued up to this point in This morning, we held a short meeting with our Arbitrators in which we provided them with orientation on this proceeding and have also provided them with materials, the direct cases, our rulings as well and have informed them of the issues that we have designated to this point in time and also have made them aware of the possibility of further motions that may be submitted to resolve some outstanding discovery related matters.

And I guess really at this point without further ado, I will turn it over to the Arbitrators today to discuss the schedule, so I hope all of you have brought your calendars.

While this proceeding is going on the only person from the Copyright Office who you will see coming in and out of the proceedings will be Gina

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Giuffreda who is in the back of the room and Gina will be the liaison for the Arbitrators, as well as for us at the Copyright Office. Neither Tanya nor I will attend any of the hearings or participate in any way whatsoever until the 180 days is done and we have a decision in our hands.

As Gina will probably point out to you, if you have any further submissions or there is materials that are going to be coming in to the Arbitrators, whether it be motions or documents that you are going to be filing or papers, you are to see Gina and file them with her. Please do not submit them to any of the Arbitrators or catch anybody in the hall and say five or original and here's an a particular Everything should go through Gina and proceeding. when you're outside of this hearing room if you need to contact the Arbitrators with any questions, whether they be procedural in nature or I guess to a certain limited extent substantive -we don't want obviously have any ex parte exchanges, but if you need to find out when a hearing is going to be or there's concerns about as we get into the winter time what the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

availability is going to be, you should contact Gina. Please do not make attempts to contact the Arbitrators directly.

Are there any questions before the baton is officially passed?

Very good. I wish all of you well and I hope everything goes well. I'm sure that our Arbitrators are going to do a just and fair job and I trust that all of you will present your evidence that will enable them to do that.

Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Thank you. we've had the opportunity to read the materials that you have filed. There have been several motions and orders on those motions and as you realize there are still some outstanding preliminary matters, particularly with regard to designated issues related to the status of the IPG's representation of its redaction claimants; orpossible redaction documents submitted under seal and then certain documents underlying the claim of each IPG claimant. We are aware that there might be able some other

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

preliminary matters that could be filed shortly. If those additional motions are filed, those too will need to be handled prior to any hearings.

The threshold issue, of course, is the status of certain claimants. I don't know whether everyone has a calendar with them, but if you don't 180 days sounds like a lot right now, or does when you're in elementary school and you're trying to figure out how long a semester is going to be, but we are talking about really quite a very short period, particularly because we do have some preliminary matters and we have holidays in the midst of that and then there's tax season. But one of the big issues for us is the fact that we want to give you a fair and equitable hearing process and we want to make sure that everyone is heard, but we also want to have sufficient time to evaluate the findings of fact and conclusions of law at the end so that the decision that is rendered will be fair, equitable and will respect the opportunity that everyone has had to share their thoughts about the situation and will be one that hopefully will be a satisfactory rendering for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

all parties involved.

Looking at the calendar, the three of us have talked about the fact that we're talking an end date of April 16. We would expect the end date for findings of fact and conclusions of law to be February 15 that gives us time to evaluate the entire situation, including all hearings that have been conducted.

So do we have any additional issues that we need to take care of prior to that?

In our suggested schedule that was provided to us, we realize we have several items to cover. One is the resolution of the status of the claimants. That will have to be the first issue. Any additional discovery, any further pre-hearing requests and then hearings on written and direct cases. Then there will be a rebuttal matter, perhaps. Hearings on rebuttal cases, if necessary and then the proposed findings. So we're talking between now and February 15, all of those items being handled.

Any comments?

It might be helpful if either party thinks

NEAL R. GROSS

that they're going to be filing any motions to just let -- you don't have to let us know that you absolutely are, but it might be helpful so we can sort of put that in the pile of trying to decide what we have to schedule, when and how.

MR. TUCCI: I'll go, if that's all right.

MR. TUCCI: I'll go, if that's all right.

On behalf of the Program Suppliers, we have -- we talked about this and actually we've had some talks between our camps with respect to a proposed schedule.

I can honestly say that the proposed schedule did not result in findings being submitted on February 15th.

It was more like March 19th which I understand is a very short period of time.

In working through that, we had discussed the issues that had to be decided prior to this thing moving forward to a hearing and I can tell you from our standpoint what those issues are and what we view as a potential timing for the decision on those issues.

And in looking at this and in discussing it, we realize that there's only five hearing days between, I think the week before Thanksgiving and the

2.2

week after New Year's. It only has five hearing days in it, so that's a pretty large block of time without very many dates in it.

The way we had envisioned it was the pre-hearing material being decided prior to the holidays and then going into the hearing directly after the holidays. If that doesn't work, it doesn't work. We'll work something else out, obviously. But from our standpoint, the issues that need to be decided are number one, the representation agreements. We have not been afforded an opportunity to review unredacted representation agreements.

I don't want to say anything that you all already know, but just as a way of a little bit of background, we filed, the Program Suppliers filed a motion to dismiss in May of this past year. Copyright Office ruled on that in June of this year, designating it to the CARP for ultimate determination. What became extremely important by way of that ruling was the status of the parties and the status of the parties as evidenced by the representation We had asked for in discovery copies of agreements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the representation agreements and were afforded copies but they were in a heavily redacted form. Separately from our motion to dismiss, we filed a motion for basically unredacted copies of the agreements.

Now the Copyright Office didn't rule on that because of the representation status issue being put on the CARP. It also put on the panel the issue of what portions of the redactions were appropriate and what portions were not appropriate. In the interim, there has been a general protective order entered in this case. So I'm not sure that a confidentiality issue currently exists, but it may but in any event, we obviously need to see, in our view, copies of the underlying documents to the factual assertion of representation.

Secondly, there was a series of telephone calls and conference calls with the Copyright Office related to this issue which resulted in a filing, I think it was last week, right, on October 10th of additional material which we understand IPG is relying on to supplement the material already in the record with respect to representation. We have never seen

that.

1.

We don't have a motion pending. We could certainly make an oral motion right now to be afforded the opportunity to see those documents. Once we get a hold of those documents which we believe we're entitled to, we also believe that there should be an opportunity to do additional discovery, some follow up discovery requests based on whatever those documents contain which again were information deficient at the present time.

That process is going to take probably a couple of weeks. And I don't see how it can be shortened. If you all are ready to rule today on the issue of the confidentiality and the redaction that obviously would speed things up. Otherwise, I can just tell you what the dates that we proposed and I don't know that we're in agreement with these, but we've had a general discussion with respect to starting, I think, on January 8th, that I understood was an agreeable date for starting the actual formal hearings.

MR. LUTZKER: Maybe before we get into the

dates, depending upon the dates are one issue and
so what are the issues and that sort of impacts on
dates. I think we are in agreement that given the
schedule that was sort of laid out in the announcement
of the CARP and the unavailable dates of the CARP that
the notion of handling any additional motions and
there are some that obviously Programs' parties have
that IPG has issues as well, that the schedule between
now and the dates that will be available essentially
for the balance of this month, November and December,
would really afford an opportunity to get all these
other issues resolved and then to start a hearing sort
of in the first full week in January and I think we're
in agreement on that, as a practical thing although we
were not anticipating if it were the 15th date and
obviously that factors in. I think just briefly, in
sort of complementing or sort of adding to sort of the
background which I'm sure you have some background on
this, the IPG provided what we called redacted copies
of the contracts to the Program Suppliers. Issues
were raised about the redactions. This was also done
in the point without any agreement in place. This was

done, not by IPG not withholding any material, but providing material less information in the contracts which it deems as confidential, specifically commission and financial information dealing with his clients was not an issue in this proceeding. And then separately matters that relate to matters unrelated to U.S. CARPs.

I understood the Copyright Office's ruling, it was in your hand to make a decision as to whether or not any documents beyond the redacted material that was already provided and I'll add that one issue that had come up which we did address separately in discovery was the signatures that were perhaps unclear because of the way people scrawled their names, who signed it and sort of where -- that information was already provided so really the issue on redacting again may be something that if you've had a chance to review the material it may or may not be a discovery issue. If it is a discovery issue, there may be additional sort of either motions or discussion about that, but it may not be an issue because you may make a judgment that the redactions were made and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

material has nothing to do with this proceeding. And even though they might desire to see the material, it really doesn't have relevance. I mean we have entered into the confidentiality agreement as was noted, subsequent to this in light of the inability of IPG to get any information that was deemed confidential without the agreement and we ultimately entered into an executed confidential agreement.

That agreement has been the basis upon the Program Suppliers providing certain documents under the strictest of conditions and as I've alerted Greg, we have some issue as to whether or not this information is truly confidential or whether some of that material can otherwise be made available on less than a strictly confidential basis. In part, we're dealing in a situation with a small claimant, if you will, on the one hand, who is trying to cope with the costs of the legal proceeding and sort of dealing with whatever he has to deal with and having the ability to work with the materials themselves, saves him both time and effort, plus he has expertise that I personally don't have with regard to some of this

material and it's a significant cost savings factor for a small claimant. So we'll raise these issues and that would be something that's not -- I don't remember if the paperwork is sort of -- the paperwork to date would not have fully described these issues, but we will lay them out and the Copyright Office gave us seven days from the initiation of the CARP to do that which would be next Tuesday and we would prepare and file something to explain our position on that.

I didn't mean to want to get MR. TUCCI: into any sort of argument on the bona fides. I don't think that that's probably what we -- what you're looking for and correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm happy to do that, but I'm just trying to lay out the issues. As we see them, the need to go forward prior to -need to be decided prior to going forward with the hearing schedule. The other thing is once the documents that we feel we're entitled to have been received and reviewed and we do our follow-up discovery request, we are going to be filing a renewed motion to dismiss which is not going to look exactly like the first motion to dismiss because we've had the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Copyright Office rulings in the interim and they've
2	shifted the focus to some degree on different matters.
3	So it's not a situation where the motion that was
4	designated to you for decision, I think, can just be
5	decided the way it is. A lot of it hinges on what
6	these documents say and their relevance to the
7	inquiry.
8	I don't know whether it would be helpful.
9	We printed out a proposed schedule. We printed enough
10	copies for everybody to have it. I don't know if you
11	want it.
12	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Is this a joint
13	proposed scheduled? Quasi-joint proposal?
14	MR. LUTZKER: Quasi. Greg and I had
15	conversation yesterday. I'd say it's sort of the
16	big issues were probably pretty close on. There were
17	some dates in between, sort of that might need to
18	be tweaked based on my schedule, my client's schedule,
19	sort of the order of witnesses. But I'd say
20	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: In a general time
21	frame.
22	MR. LUTZKER: In a general sense, yes. I

1	think I don't have any problem adding
2	complementing whatever he wants to circulate.
3	MR. TUCCI: And obviously the dates that
4	are on here are not etched in stone. We just put this
5	together to try and move this forward
6	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: To get started.
7	Very good.
8	(Copies of proposed scheduled
9	distributed.)
10	MR. TUCCI: We have cut this to a bare
11	minimum. We have the rebuttal case being filed two
12	weeks after the end of the direct case which is a very
13	tight time frame.
14	We have the proposed findings and the
15	brief two weeks after the end of let's see yeah,
16	two weeks after the end of rebuttal.
17	I don't know that we can go any faster
18	than that. But the benefit is there are only two
19	parties in this case and the issues are, I think,
20	fairly narrow and depending on the outcome of the
21	Program Suppliers' renewed Motion to Dismiss, they
22	could be narrowed even further than they are today.

But obviously, we want to give the Panel the adequate opportunity to digest the information and the briefs and the proposed findings in the matter and render its decision.

MR. LUTZKER: And I would say that sort of where I would have sort of recommendations on this, we now have sort of October 24th as a date that IPG would have to file its request for guarding the Protective I think that the November 20th which they characterize as the Motions to Dismiss is really sort of any final motions. Ours may be characterized as Motions to Strike rather than Motions to Dismiss. And in deference to the fact that that is -- and I think there are advantages to filing the motions prior to Thanksgiving. The oppositions which are in our view important documents, in this particular proceeding, they have scheduled it so that there's a 7-day period, but it doesn't take into account Thanksgiving. Ι would recommend -- and December 1 is a Wednesday. recommend doing it on a Friday to take -- because I know that --

MR. TUCCI: We actually moved that to the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Friday. 1 MR. Oh, December 1 is the 2 LUTZKER: Friday, okay. 3 MR. TUCCI: Based on the discussion, yes. 4 Okay, great, then I'm in 5 MR. LUTZKER: agreement with that. I was working with the earlier 6 7 MR. TUCCI: No, we understood your point 8 9 and that gives you two full weeks basically to respond. 10 MR. LUTZKER: Yeah, I think that's -- and 11 12 you get two full weeks, right. I think we're trying to do this in -- and I think we're looking, frankly, 13 also at the CARP dates that were sort of 14 15 unavailable -- there's a substantial block of December 16 where the CARP is unavailable and we figured if we can 17 get these motions out of the way, because 18 discovery is not -- is either done or will generate motions based -- and so we figure we've got to get 19 20 that material to you. Your actions on those will then 21 perhaps further narrow the case or at least define the

case and give us -- we have resolution of that before

the end of the month of December. We're then in a 1 situation to sort of know about the hearing. I'll get 2 to the hearing, but in other words, that was our, I 3 think our mutual reaction to the schedule and your 4 availability was that rather than trying -- we didn't 5 see really a feasible way of resolving these issues 6 7 and squeezing in actual hearing dates before the first week in January. 8 9 MR. TUCCI: Right, and it didn't make any sense to have a couple of hearing dates if the hearing 10 wasn't going to be completed until after the holidays 11 12 anyway, because you just gain a couple of days. There's not much point in doing it that way. 13 14 The other thing that I'd mention about the 15 Motions to Dismiss period, there are two days in the middle of December that you all are available. 16 17 think it's the 8th and the 11th which is a Friday and 18 a Monday. I would propose that the 11th be used as a date for oral argument --19 20 MR. LUTZKER: If necessary. 21 MR. TUCCI: If necessary. We wouldn't 22 propose to schedule an argument, but if you all

desired argument on any issue in the Motions to Strike, Motions to Dismiss, we would propose that as a date to do it.

JUDGE COOLEY: Which date again? 11th?

MR. LUTZKER: The 11th. December. That was one of your available dates.

(Pause.)

MR. TUCCI: Other than doing that preliminary Motion to Dismiss period prior to the initiation of the hearing, the hearing follows, like I said, earlier a very tight schedule of two weeks for rebuttal, a truncated discovery schedule where all motions regarding discovery are heard quickly and I think on the same day. I think we simultaneously do motions, in an effort to speed it up and give you as much time as possible.

We're doing document productions in one and two day turnaround. And of course, there's no guarantee that the issues for rebuttal will be substantial. We obviously don't know what they will be right now. We have a fairly good idea because we've had the direct cases for a fair amount of time,

but nothing is certain until the hearing occurs.

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: How about this, why don't the parties take about a ten minute break? You can stay here and we can go in there. That will give us a chance to look at this, digest a little of it and we'll be back in about 10 minutes.

Thank you.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: That's the longest ten-minute break ever, but we needed the time to really take a look at the schedules and set some priorities and examine what your priorities were and Jack Cooley has been our scribe and has offered to run through a proposed revised calendar, taking your calendar and some realities and trying to find a good way to meet everybody's needs.

JUDGE COOLEY: I'm the designated negotiator on this, ladies and gentlemen. Here is our concern, we need at the very minimum 30 days to have this under advisement and that -- we would like to have more. We understand that you need the time and the case needs the time and parties need the time and

so forth, but we need that as a minimum and so we set that as our limitation.

And we want to say this, let's just take

-- the only change that we have to your proposed
schedule, and thank you by the way for coming up with
this, is and we've already talked about it before.

December 11th, we're going to kind of pencil in a
possible argument on motions, I believe. So we all
agree on that. That's no problem.

We took then a look at the month of February. Uр to February 5th on the schedule everything is intact. That's what we propose. And what we saw when we looked at the month of February was really a discovery month. We want to shorten that discovery period a lot, but not to the detriment of the parties. What we would like to do is accelerate the process and we're suggesting this. February 5th, complete the document production. And by that time I think that you will know, hopefully, what your followup discovery requests are going to be. In order to shorten this period, we would like to do a lot of this orally. And we are proposing this. We looked at the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	schedule. We have, on our schedules anyway, February
2	6th and 7th are open. What we are proposing is that
3	each side or party, come in with their requests for
4	document requests that you have. If you need time
5	that day, even to look at them or if you can get them
6	even to each other the proceeding day, that we come in
7	and discuss those. And you can determine what you
8	need, what you don't have, what you're looking for.
9	I would assume that by this time and this case you
10	folks should have a pretty good idea of what, whether
11	or not you're willing to produce those or what. What
12	we'd like to do then is set those two days aside to
13	work out all the discovery problems. We think that
14	there may not be a lot of documents coming out of
15	this. We think that there might be just a few issues.
16	We might even be able to resolve some on your own.
17	And we would then rule, if not on the 7th, very
18	shortly after that. You'd have all the rulings.
19	You'd know exactly what we think you should produce,
20	each side. And we would then eliminate a lot of the
21	briefing that's going on here, okay?

That brings us down to -- well, we say --

1	oh, brings us down to February what we'd like to do
2	is have the rebuttal hearing, if we rule shortly,
3	either on the 7th or the 8th or 9th on this, we'd like
4	to have the rebuttal hearings on February 20th and
5	21st.
6	MR. TUCCI: Before we move off that, can
7	I ask a question, please?
8	JUDGE COOLEY: Sure.
9	MR. TUCCI: The procedure that you're
10	envisioning is that we discuss with one another the
11	follow-up requests on the 6th, is that right?
12	JUDGE COOLEY: Yes, I think that you're
13	going to need that time, maybe that morning or
14	something.
15	MR. TUCCI: Okay. And then we come to you
16	on the 7th with any disagreements that we have?
17	MR. LUTZKER: Or the 6th.
18	MR. TUCCI: Or the 6th.
19	JUDGE COOLEY: We could be here both days
20	so that some things you might be able to bring to us
21	or want to bring to us right away. We will be here to
22	hear your motion, essentially. The rulings will be in

writing.

MR. LUTZKER: In other words, it will be orally presented and then ruling --

JUDGE COOLEY: The ruling would either be on the 7th or 8th or 9th, whenever we can write it up. We don't know what's going to be. It might take some thought and some reasoning.

MR. TUCCI: And then the documents would be immediately producible at the time of the ruling.

JUDGE COOLEY: That's our thought. And so those rulings would be hopefully out by the latest the 9th, February 9th. We would have rebuttal hearings on February 20th and 21st. We are suggesting March 2nd as the date for filing proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. One week later, March 9th, for reply, proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law. We are setting closing arguments on March 16th. We think that these will be needed and helpful to us. And if we don't think we need them, we'll let you know, but I think that you can plan on that as probably a firm date. And then our decision is due on April 16th.

1	MR. TUCCI: I have one you would have
2	the argument on the 16th?
3	JUDGE COOLEY: That's what we're
4	proposing. If that's not a good date.
5	(Pause.)
6	MR. TUCCI: It's more like a personal
7	thing in terms of being out. There's a likelihood of
8	sort of with school schedules and things, that's like
9	a travel week.
10	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Spring week.
11	MR. TUCCI: From what I understand.
12	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: I would urge
13	everyone to get their reservations for the rebuttal
14	hearings in February because that would mean you would
15	fly in on the 19th which is Washington's Birthday,
16	holiday, whatever they call that, President's Day, but
17	it probably is a big travel day for certain people.
18	MR. LUTZKER: I don't know if you have
19	flexibility on sort of between the 16th and the next
20	available CARP day which I guess is the 22nd.
21	You would envision only one day for oral?
22	JUDGE COOLEY: I think we're going to need

1	a month. It's not only drafting it up. It's also
2	collaborating and making sure that we all agree on all
3	aspects of the decision too which takes time.
4	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: And we want to give
5	it our full and fair attention. I think it would be
6	remiss not to do that. It wouldn't be fair to either
7	party or to the process and because of that, we do
8	need to at least have that month period, that 30-day
9	period.
LO	MR. TUCCI: It's fine with us. I don't
11	think we have a problem with compressing the discovery
12	schedule.
L3	JUDGE COOLEY: Shall we leave it for the
L4	March 16th as the
L5	MR. LUTZKER: Yes.
L6	JUDGE COOLEY: And if there is a problem
L7	we can talk about it between now and then. Who knows,
L8	maybe
19	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Because schedules
20	may shift.
21	JUDGE COOLEY: Our schedules may change.
22	Madam Chair, I'm finished.
I	

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: You're finished, 1 So everybody is clear on that? 2 okay. One other item we talked about briefly 3 before the documents that were filed on October 10th 4 and they were filed by IPG, confidential documents. 5 6 Although there was a motion that spoke to them, we would need a formal motion to add those in if that's 7 what you wanted to request, just so that we have the 8 paper on file. 9 MR. TUCCI: We'll file it. 10 CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: We appreciate your 11 1.2 willingness to shorten the discovery. We don't want this to be the detriment of either party or anybody in 13 14 the room, but we think that with that expedited 15 schedule will provide the Panel to truly examine all of the issues, be able to weigh all of the evidence 16 17 and have a fair and impartial response and that's why 18 we're here. 19 Does anyone have any other business? 20 MR. TUCCI: Just a procedural matter. Should we re-do the schedule and provide it to Gina, 21 22 the way that you all would want us to proceed?

1	JUDGE COOLEY: I think that would be very
2	useful.
3	MS. GIUFFREDA: Usually, the Panel issues
4	an order setting the schedule out.
5	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: But it wouldn't
6	hurt to have you so that we all know we're on the same
7	sheet.
8	If there was a question, we could make
9	that clear.
10	MR. LUTZKER: We can circulate that
11	MR. TUCCI: We'll do that int he next few
12	days if that's sufficient.
13	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Anything else?
14	MR. OLANIRAN: The daily schedule. What
15	time periods we're going to run through, when we start
16	and when we end, when we take a break.
17	MR. TUCCI: We have in this proceeding in
18	the past decided what the start time is, the break
19	times, the lunch period, the end times, things like
20	that. We're prepared to discuss it now. We're
21	prepared to discuss it right before the hearing,
22	whatever is your preference.

1	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Why don't you give
2	us feedback right now? I think that would be helpful
3	to us to hear what might be more feasible for both
4	parties.
5	MR. TUCCI: What had been done in the
6	prior proceedings was a start time of 9:30, going to
7	12:30, a one hour lunch and ending at 4:30 with two
8	10-minute breaks in each 3-hour block. Two breaks in
9	the morning, two breaks in the afternoon.
10	That is fine with us. We're certainly
11	flexible to the extent that it looks like we're coming
12	up on to the extent that it looks the hearing is
13	taking longer than perhaps we thought it would for a
14	particular witness. We're certainly flexible and
15	we'll stay longer.
16	MR. LUTZKER: Yes, I mean, I think also
17	based on witness sort of travel and scheduling it may
18	be necessary to run somewhat longer.
19	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: In order to get
20	them off so they don't have to
21	MR. TUCCI: So they don't have to stay
22	until the next day.

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: That makes absolute 1 2 sense to me. Any objection to that? I don't know if this ever JUDGE COOLEY: 3 comes up and I don't know if I should raise it, once 4 in a while we have a situation where we have to go 5 over or think we have to go over to Saturday and I was 6 7 just wondering and I don't even know if any of our -we have one week, I think, one full week of hearing in 8 9 January. I guess my basic question is is there any --I mean is this building and room open on Saturday? 10 MS. GIUFFREDA: The building always is 11 12 You have to let me know so we can get special permission. 13 14 JUDGE COOLEY: We hope that doesn't 15 happen. 16 MR. LUTZKER: One of the things that we were going to suggest which is sort of raised by that 17 in looking at sort of -- I think initiation of the 18 19 hearing, we were going to suggest IPG's Raul Galaz 20 comes from Texas and he will be traveling. If he were the initial witness in the beginning of the week and 21 22 Ms. Kessler who is local, from our point of view I

1	think a week we anticipate a week would
2	accommodate. We haven't really talked through this,
3	but the likelihood the week is there, but it gives
4	additional flexibility if Mr. Galaz is first and I
5	know NPA has sort of a preference that they initiate
6	the proceeding. From a scheduling point of view, his
7	personal schedule and other commitments make it more
8	desirable that he sort of not go into a later week,
9	but I know that you do have Monday which will be the
10	15th of January.
11	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Will it open on a
12	national holiday?
13	MS. GIUFFREDA: No.
14	MR. LUTZKER: Or the 16th, I guess
15	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: Martin Luther King
16	Day.
17	MR. LUTZKER: It will be closed
18	whatever the holiday is, but there would be additional
19	time during the following week, if it had to run over,
20	so we could sort of keep the continuity of the
21	schedule.
22	MR. TUCCI: On that point, we would prefer

that our witness go first. It has been -- in the past, the proceeding has proceeded with the largest claimant first, the broadest claim first. I think that that's appropriate in this case. It gives the panel I think the broad background knowledge with respect to the claim rather than a smaller, more limited claimant with a more limited perspective and I think it just makes sense to go in that broad to narrow approach as opposed to narrow to broad.

We are -- that being said, we are perfectly willing to accommodate Mr. Galaz' schedule in any way that we can and set a certain start time for him and those sorts of matters.

We can say that he is going to start on Thursday at 9:30, January 11th.

JUDGE COOLEY: If that's convenient --

MR. LUTZKER: Well, again, I think that the -- a critical thing we need to deal with is just the availability of the dates, to make sure that we have the hearing accommodated within the date periods, the idea of sort of having continuity with witnesses is also pretty critical, I think, in terms of just the

comprehensiveness of understanding what's going on.

JUDGE COOLEY: While we're on that topic, have we really been informed as to how long the Program Suppliers' case is proposed to be, its direct case?

MR. TUCCI: We have thought that it would take two full days, maybe two and a half. So that's why I was suggesting that we set Mr. Galaz for Thursday, the 11th because that gives us obviously enough time to do the opening argument and the direct case, as well as that was what we're assuming would be the total time for direct and cross examination, I'm sorry. The direct case, I think you're probably talking four to six hours, something like that, testimony and obviously, it's up to you to determine how long you would be cross examining.

MR. LUTZKER: Well, I think the idea of the full week is reasonable. It could extend beyond that. Obviously, there are discovery issues. There are additional motions that would be relevant to the nature of the case that have to be resolved. So the full breadth of the case, it would take longer.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

As I said, I think we should be able to accomplish this within a week, based on the cases that have been filed.

CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: I think that if we get into that, if we feel we need a few extra hours, we can certainly go further than 4:30 and that might accommodate everyone without asking to come back the next week and incurring the expense, cost, time, everything else that's involved in re-entering that process. It's more difficult, I think, for the witnesses to take the weekend break and come back than anybody else and they need to have a fair opportunity to be heard at their best, if you will.

So I think we should look at that week, due to the fact that we have a very finite time schedule, try to accomplish what we need to do in that week, if we need to extend an hour or so in the afternoon on any of those days, if we would all accommodate that to our schedules and try to keep on track. I think the expedited process would be accomplished, but I think it would also be in the best interest of the parties and again those witnesses who

1	have to be in the hot seat during that time.
2	Is that
3	JUDGE DAVIS: How late is the building
4	open?
5	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: We can have the
6	building extended somewhat, can't we, in the
7	afternoon?
8	MS. GIUFFREDA: Just let me know, so I can
9	let them know downstairs. They come around to close
10	up and if they don't know that you're supposed to be
11	they'll kick you out. If they know you're going to be
12	here
13	CHAIRPERSON CAMPBELL: We can do that.
14	Anything else then? I think we've accomplished what
15	we need to accomplish.
16	Thank you all for appearing today and we
17	look forward to working with you over the next several
18	months.
19	We are adjourned until the next gathering.
20	(Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m., the proceedings
21	were concluded.)
22	

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing:

Distribution of 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997 Cable Royalty Funds, Docket No. 2000-2 CARP CD 93-97

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

October 17, 2000

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Mufuffy